

A REVIEW

OF THE

DISCUSSION RELATIVE TO

THE

MOUNT CARROLL SEMINARY.

PUBLISHED BY JUDSON & McCLEDER,
JOURNAL BOOK & JOB OFFICE,
FREEPORT, ILL.
1857.

MT. CARROLL SEMINARY.

The attention of an intelligent public is respectfully called to an examination of the following pages, as they contain an explanation of various matters and circumstances that have been connected with a series of articles, relative to the Mt. Carroll Seminary, its Principals, Teachers, management and character. The first of these articles written by Mr. C. Gray, appeared in the *Mt. Carroll Republican* of May 8th, and contained assertions relative to the Seminary, that were erroneous, and also some unjust reflections upon the Baptist faith. I replied to Mr. Gray's attack upon the Seminary, and at the same time stated that being myself a Presbyterian, I did not desire to enter into any defence of the Baptist creed, feeling that some one of that persuasion could refute Mr. Gray's statements in that respect better than I could. These articles were succeeded by others, (of which it is unnecessary for me to speak at length) until Mr. Gray seeing that his various arguments were unsound, and that the whole ground taken by him was untenable, withdrew from the *Republican*, at the same time hinting at some "painful developments" which it was in his power to produce. These were called for, and Mr. Gray has recently issued a pamphlet wherein he claims to have set forth these developments in such a manner as to effectually invalidate my testimony, and that of others, disgrace the Seminary, its Principals and defenders.

In his desperate attempts to extricate himself from his menervable situation in the view of the public, Mr. Gray may have been able to cloud his own mind so as to believe himself successful in his endeavors, but an unprejudiced public cannot be so easily blinded. Mr. Gray claims I have made a false representation in calling myself a Presbyterian. I was not aware that it was in the power of any individual to obtain such a knowledge of the consciousness and internal impressions of others, as would enable him thereby to determine the peculiar religious views of such persons. He says Mr. G. has reached a new era in the history of mankind, in saying that I was not a Presby-

terian; I supposed that I was more familiar with my own sentiments than any other person could be; but Mr. Gray comes forward and states to the world in contradiction of my declaration, that I am not a Presbyterian, but a Baptist, and hence what I say should not be allowed to have any influence in deciding the question. Why did not this idea penetrate his cranium before this late period; and why has he hitherto been so very careful to keep this important information to himself. Can it be possible that he has thought of my yearly subscription towards his salary, and stifled the monitions of conscience by withholding such a revelation of my duplicity! But then how could he accept support from me, when "*he had his doubts painful,*" that my subscription money was tainted with the plague of the "still worm." I should have supposed the idea would have been extremely repugnant to his sensitive conscientiousness. Now as he accepted my subscriptions in the most cordial manner, without the least expression of misgiving, is it not clearly evident according to his own arguments that he has exhibited himself as being most culpably influenced by the "dollar power?" The evidence is too conclusive to admit of doubt.

The facts in regard to my connection with the distillery are these:

I engaged in the distilling business only a short time after I joined the church of which Mr. Gray was then, and is still, the pastor, and the idea of manufacturing "High Wines," was first suggested to my friend Mr. Rinewalt and myself, by Mr. Gray, and he at the same time spoke of Mr. ———, of Buffalo Grove, a highly respectable and honorable person, and also a temperance man, who was about to engage in the business.

In order to show that my statement is corroborated by Mr. Rinewalt, the following communication from him is here inserted.

N. HALDERMAN,

DEAR SIR:—You request me to give you as near as I can, "the conversation I had with the Rev. C. Gray of Mt. Carroll, on the subject of making High Wines." At the time of this conversation the Rev. Mr. Gray and I were very intimate, indeed I seriously contemplated uniting with his Church, and he very often called on me to converse with me on the subject. At one of these interviews, after we had talked the church matter over, I said to him, I really felt discouraged and felt at times like leaving the State. He asked me my reasons. I told him for the last few years the wheat crop had failed so much and the quality of the grain was so poor that we could make nothing by continuing the business. I told him too we had thought of changing our business to the manufacture of corn meal or paper, but

after informing ourselves on the subject we feared it would not pay.

He then remarked "could you not make *High Wines* out of the wheat? I told him I really did not know what the article was. He informed me what it was. I asked whether that was not whiskey. He said not. It was no more of a beverage than the article it was made out of. He said it was an article extensively used in the manufacturing of various things and was indispensable. He told me he had a friend in Buffalo village, then putting up an establishment of that kind, and that this friend had told him that the making of High Wines was just as honorable a business as any that could be followed.

You know we then wrote to a number of persons and called on them personally, to ascertain whether these things were as Mr. Gray had told me, and we found in our enquiries his assertions were sustained, and then concluded to go into the business, which we have since often regretted; not that we believe it an immoral business, but it does not pay.

This is about the substance of the conversation you refer to, with the reasons that led to it. And I here declare with an uplifted hand that I never thought of this business until the Reverend gentleman called my attention to it and recommended it. I do positively declare that the distillery at Mt. Carroll, was built under the influence of Mr. Gray's suggestions, and under his positive assurance that the making of High Wines was as honorable and just a business as could be followed.

Yours Truly,

JOHN RINEWALT.

In view of the Agricultural prospects of the community at that time, and acting upon the suggestion of Mr. Gray, letters of inquiry were sent by us in all directions in order to obtain information in regard to the business. After receiving satisfactory information, we engaged in the business without misgivings, and as we felt with honest motives, as will be seen from the following explanation. At the time of which I am speaking there were large surplus quantities of coarse grain raised in this region, for which there was no market, as the country was new, and there was no means of transporting produce to distant markets. By opening a distillery it was proposed to furnish a home demand for coarse grain, and thereby the farming community would be benefitted, as well as the Hydraulic Company; and at the same time the "High Wines" were to be converted into burning fluid and were not to be sold in such a manner as to bring reproach upon the Company, for vending them as intoxicating liquors. This was our design in starting the distillery, and our intention in

regard to the use to which the "High Wines" should be applied, has been conscientiously fulfilled.

And now what was the reason of Mr. Gray's silence upon this subject previous to the time he imagines my influence and sympathies were transferred to the Baptist Church? According to his own reasoning, the Presbyterian Church must have borne an undivided share in upholding the iniquity of the distillery by permitting me to retain my membership among them. Why did Mr. Gray then hold his peace, and why did he not subsequently unite his influence openly with others who were striving to overthrow the distillery; and why has he at all times previous to this public declaration in his pamphlet, given me to understand that he regarded the business as all right. His "doubts painful" must have been excited long before his "repudiation" of the concern, and now I ask what prevented him from adopting the course he has recommended as being the one I should have pursued in regard to himself. Before this repudiation of his appeared, he called me "*brother*," now why did he not go to his brother long long ago, and warn him of his error, and urge him to desist from prosecuting such business. Where is the consistency displayed by Mr. Gray in the course he has taken. It is clearly evident that he has brought up the distillery and an imaginary connection between it and the Baptist Church and Seminary, in order to create a side issue to turn attention from his defeat in his attack upon the Seminary. He may well fear the force of testimony that annihilates every suspicion of wrong and injustice that he has attempted to fasten upon the Mt. Carroll Seminary. By various shallow artifices he has vainly tried to depreciate such evidence and cast an odium upon it, but all his efforts have proved utterly futile in accomplishing his malignant scheme. He has in his folly prepared a weapon to destroy others, that he is powerless to wield, and which will assuredly recoil upon himself; let him then not complain of being crushed, for that fatal act is one of which he alone will be the author.

And now let us look at this "*dollar power*" that he speaks of as having such an irresistible force. The examining committee claim that the Mt. Carroll Seminary has added much to the character of the place, and this no one will attempt to deny. Who does not know and realize that such an institution of learning of a high moral tone, exerts a powerful influence upon society for good? Yes, an influence that cannot be estimated in dollars and cents! Who would deny that a Seminary like our own has a tendency to induce persons of integrity and worth to locate here, that their sons and daughters may receive the benefits which it confers? Is the "*dollar influence of such*"

persons worth nothing in our town? And must the motives of persons be impugned, (and that too of a minister of the gospel) who openly uphold and encourage our Seminary for its intrinsic worth? We may well claim it for our interest to sustain the Seminary, but it is not merely an interest growing out of the paltry sordid dollar; but Mr. G. gives no credit for being actuated by pure or unselfish motives. He asserts that a "crushing exigence" is calling out the "dollar power" for the support of the Seminary. This we deny. The prospects of the Seminary were never more favorable than at present. That it is now, or has been laboring under the influence of a pressing emergency is absolutely and unequivocally false, for notwithstanding all the influence its opponents have tried to exert to crush it, a new school year has recently opened, under the most flattering auspices. The number of pupils is unusually large, and every indication denotes unparalleled prosperity.

The large addition to the building that is now in progress, has not been the result of Baptist efforts, but is merely an effort to increase the accommodations at the Seminary to correspond with the demand that has been steadily and rapidly increasing. The cry of "*crushing exigence*," is a false alarm made to suit the convenience of those who desire to destroy its well earned and exalted reputation.

The "*trinity in unity*" mentioned by Mr. Gray is a sheer fabrication of his own distorted imagination. Its existence is neither seen or felt in our midst, and bitter indeed must be the sectarian prejudice and jealousy that will prompt any man to assert the reality of such an existence. Herein Mr. Gray stands convicted of attempting to perpetrate the very crime of which he accuses me, viz moral fraud. He wearies the patience of all parties by resorting to miserable subterfuges, and by his artful endeavors to evade the overwhelming evidence of truth. "The card of "Many Citizens," is referred to by Mr. Gray, and we are tauntingly asked how "*all*" are interested on a "*common conceded base*," except on the "dollar principle." I reply on the broad base of humanity. All are interested in the progress of science, inasmuch as it tends to the moral as well as the intellectual elevation of society; and everything that advances the cause of science, truth and virtue, should be warmly and faithfully sustained by every individual in "the pile of human kind." Here is a wide field in which "*all*" may labor and be "deeply interested." It seems Mr. Gray, an ambassador of Christ, is making a common cause with infidels, in attacking the Seminary, and at the same time he is sneeringly demanding how "*all*" can be interested in common cause. Surely if ministers of Christ and scoffing unbelievers can find

a common platform of action aside from the *mighty dollar*, they being the extremes of society, what may not be expected of the intermediate grades?

Mr. Gray thus quotes the language of one of the defendants of the Seminary. "I have talked against the Seminary, but now I am going to defend it." Why has he not given the whole truth. Why had he talked against the Seminary, but would now sustain it. I will answer. A malicious falsehood had been repeated to him respecting the Seminary, and while he considered that statement as correct, he could not lend his influence in favor of the Seminary, but when convinced of its falsity, with the candor that ever characterizes an honest mind, he was ready, not only to retract the ground he had taken while under erroneous impressions, but to defend the cause of injured truth, and the Seminary.

Mr. Gray places much emphasis on the card signed by forty citizens which was published in the *Republican* of June. This was an article certifying to the christian character of Mr. Gray, and at the same time it censured the Teachers of the Seminary for their letter that had appeared the week before. They were subjected to the grave charge of youth and inexperience, incompetency to judge, and that too by persons who were totally unacquainted with them. But this card was an exceeding great help to Mr. Gray, inasmuch as he was thereby enabled to resume the discussion. But this assistance will be greatly depreciated, (to use his own terms so that he may have no difficulty in understanding me) when it is known that some of those forty affirm that they were induced to sign that article under a misapprehension of its contents, and were afterwards heard to say they were thoroughly ashamed when they became fully acquainted with the document. This depreciation will be greatly increased when the names of several of those forty are seen affixed to a very different card in support of the Seminary and its unsectarian character. Indeed it is a well known fact that the great mass of our community openly condemn the course pursued by Mr. Gray, and deny his statements in regard to the Seminary, its Principals, &c.

The evidence contained in the letter written by the Teachers of the Seminary, must have been quite disagreeable to Mr. Gray, and seems to have caused him considerable uneasiness. He says he was sick criticising it, and it is thought he has given unquestionable proofs of severe illness in his spasmodic efforts to throw off such amount of disgusting misrepresentation and abuse as he has done. Really such surprising ease in crooking and dodging the question at issue, shows him to be a far greater adept in the practice of "stratagem and low cunning."

ning" than the ladies to whom he refers. In regard to Mr. Estee's visits at the Seminary, the ladies did not assert or convey the idea that Mr. G. represents. No one can read their letter, and receive the impression, that they designed to convey the idea that Elder E. was at the Seminary but three times. The true construction of their words, informs the public that Elder E. was at the Seminary a number of times, but his calls were not extended to the pupils, as he did not see them except at the table, and once to sing, and once at their own request. The statement of Miss S. Randall upon this point will be reviewed in another place.

As Mr. G. has attempted to impeach the veracity of Miss Wood in her replies to certain questions proposed by him to the Principals, the statement is here given of the Presbyterian lady whom he refers to as being present during the interview, and who was also fully acquainted with his first effort for a compromise.

"On the eve of April 29th, the 2d question sent by Mr. Gray, to the Principals, through one of the assistant Teachers, was proposed by her to them just as she was leaving the Seminary to attend a prayer meeting held at Mr. Gray's house. The first question was not stated by her for the reason that Misses W. and G. had, at the close of the examination stated publicly their determination and views so explicitly as to fully answer his first proposition, and she therefore deemed a repetition of it to them unnecessary. The second question was as follows: "Do you believe the Methodist and Presbyterian churches regular evangelical christian churches." In the hurry of the moment Miss Wood hastily replied, I have never thought them anything else. The only idea presented to her mind by the proposition, coming as it did in a verbal form, and being introduced at a moment when her attention was preoccupied with other subjects, was the evangelical christian character of the Methodist and Presbyterian churches.

This reply was given to Mr. Gray as follows. "Misses Wood and Gregory answer you in the affirmative." But, he not being satisfied sent the two questions again in a written form, accompanied by an expressed desire on his part for a compromise. This communication was presented to the Principals, the next morning, April 30th. It was first thought best to reply to Mr. Gray in writing, but in order to ascertain what the matter was to be compromised, it was finally decided to obtain a personal interview with him. Accordingly on the evening of May 8th, I accompanied Misses Wood and Gregory to the residence of Mr. Gray. During this interview, and before Miss Wood gave him any explanation of her views in relation to his question, he distinctly informed us that our call was too late, and an

explanation on his part was useless as he had an article in type which would appear in the *Republican* the next day. Upon this point Mr. Gray's assertion is in direct opposition to the truth. His first article was sent to the press and published *after* he received an affirmative reply to his questions to the Principals, and *before* any further explanation was made by them. I had every opportunity to know the facts in this instance, and speak this from personal knowledge. And now that Miss Wood, during this interview changed the affirmative answer to a negative, I positively deny. Before we concluded to call upon him, Misses Wood and Gregory prepared a written reply to send him, with which I was made acquainted, and which I heard Miss Wood repeat in substance to Mr. G., and I am thus fortunately prepared to give as nearly as possible her precise words. The following is a copy of their answer to his two questions.

REV. C. GRAY,

SIR:—In reply to your first question, "Is it your intention to conduct the Seminary on neutral grounds, &c." we would say that this has been and still is our purpose. In respect to your second question, "Do you believe the Methodist and Presbyterian churches are regular evangelical christian churches," we would say, that according to our views of church, in order to be a "regular evangelical christian church," it must conform in faith and practice to the pattern of the primitive churches planted by Christ and his apostles. Any deviation from this must constitute an *irregularity*; and as there are differences in the doctrines and practice even of the Methodist and Presbyterian churches, it seems to us that both cannot be strictly conformed to the original pattern, and therefore both cannot be altogether *regular*.

We however look upon these churches and some others as being evangelical in their character, and wish them success in the propagation of religious truth. You are evidently correct in your view with reference to the real point of difficulty in the case of the Seminary. It is sectarianism dreading sectarianism. We cannot hope to meet the wishes of all parties. It shall be our aim in the future as it has been in the past to respect the rights of others, while we claim our own, and leave it with a just God to judge between us, and those who try to injure us.

Respectfully,

WOOD & GREGORY.

The public can now see upon what grounds Mr. Gray has founded his attempt to fasten contradictory answers to his questions upon Miss Wood. It may be well to state here that the sentiments contained in the above letter were given to Mr. Gray as an expression

of views from both Misses Wood & Gregory, and what reasons he has for making Miss W. the *special* object of his attack, is a mystery.

For thus exposing facts to the broad sunlight of truth, Mr. G. has asserted that I (together with others) am no Presbyterian. "Only a pliant tool of the Baptists." This absurd assertion has neither alarmed nor intimidated me in the least; knowing as I do that Mr. G's *ipse dixit* cannot exert a particle of influence in determining the belief that I entertain.

The Teachers in their letter did not deny that the Principals had ever urged the importance of religious truth upon the minds of pupils, but urging pupils to give attention to religion is a very different thing from urging them to become Baptists. It seems that Mr. Gray arrogates to himself the right to set aside their testimony, founded upon personal knowledge and observation, and to decide upon mere hearsay evidence of the most suspicious character. It is not remarkable that he should wince under the testimony of those ladies, which though true, must have been quite humiliating to him. One word more relative to this letter. Mr. Gray has made a most wretched attempt to escape from facts stated by them, and a still more wretched attempt at criticism. He could find far more scope for his limited powers of criticism, if he would but turn his attention to his own productions, for it has rarely been my fortune to meet with such absurd attempts at argument, and nonsensical exhibitions of redundancy in expression as he has recently produced.

The following statement is from the lady who was the bearer of the oft mentioned messages:

"Mr. Gray has contradicted my statements in two prominent points. First, he says he did not call himself the prime mover of the opposition to the Principals of the Seminary. His subsequent course proves that he could have made such an assertion, if I am not believed in saying he *did do so*. Second—That he made no such statement as that he would feel called upon to carry the opposition no further if he received an affirmative reply to the questions proposed. The fact that he did make this statement, was the only consideration that induced me to become the medium of such communications. His denial of the fact does not effect its truth."

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE.

The misstatements of Mr. Gray relative to the Investigating Committee require a review:

During the progress of the revival in this place last winter, the efforts of christians in their master's cause, seemed to arouse the attention of all classes, and it soon became apparent that the wrath

of the evil one himself was kindled on account of these efforts. The vindictive feelings of opposers of religion were clearly exhibited on every side, in their endeavors to malign the cause of christianity. The Seminary, having participated in the work of revival, became a prominent object, against which the arch enemy through his willing servants directed the most malignant efforts. Consequently many slanderous reports were fabricated, that gained a darker shade by every repetition. These reports were industriously circulated by a certain class, till even professing christians gave ready credence to these rumors, and many who had, and some who had not become interested in the revival, exhibited a reprehensible spirit of envy and jealousy. They seemed to fear that their own church would not be increased by the addition of members, and as the leaven of sectarianism commenced its work in their own hearts, they advanced the charge of **sectarianism** and other kindred ones against the Seminary. These were thrown in with the idle rumors of the day, and became commingled with them until the whole became a confused mass of falsehood, without foundation in truth. At this tide of affairs, a party who had become disaffected towards the Seminary, called a public meeting for the purpose of carrying into effect some plan for starting a "Union School." The intent of the originators of this scheme was to crush the Seminary, although this idea was not designed to be made public. By means of petty artifice in concealing it, and exhibiting a false view of the thing, some well-meaning persons were persuaded at first to regard this movement favorably. But when the time appointed for the meeting, came, one who had shared the confidence of this designing clique (but who had not been thoroughly drilled to keep silence on the main object of their proceedings) arose and unwittingly exposed their designs. Here then the whole matter was out, and this was all that was necessary to ensure the downfall of the plot. The feelings of chagrin and disappointment felt by the originators of this "Union School" movement in having their base designs frustrated, was another fruitful source of mischief towards the Seminary.

About this time a circular card was issued in the *Republican* by some of our citizens, calling upon the public to investigate the whole matter, and at the same time the Principals stated that if the difficulty was not attended to *before* the close of the term by the community, measures would be taken at that time to investigate the subject. Here then the readers will perceive a call for an investigation was made nearly two months before that event transpired, thus allowing Mr. Gray and others, ample time to collect testimony, procure wit-

nesses, and in short to prepare charges and bring evidence to sustain them. In the face of these facts Mr. Gray has dared to assert that only twenty-four hours notice of the investigation was given! Again the persons who constituted the Investigating Committee were men who possessed the confidence of the community, and were in no way personally interested in the Seminary, above other individuals. These considerations, together with the fact that they constituted the last Board of Trustees, induced the Principals to invite them to act as an Investigating Committee. No measures had been taken by others to ferret out the origin of the malicious reports relative to the Seminary, hence the Principals felt that the school must rest under a stigma created by false representations, or an investigation of the matter must be made. They wisely chose the latter course.

The gentlemen invited by the Principals consented to act as committee, and accordingly at the time appointed, they met at the Seminary, to listen to charges that should be preferred, and to ascertain their truth or falsity. But where now were those who had inveighed so bitterly against the Seminary? Only one or two appeared. The great majority of them slunk away abashed, fearing to expose their vile slanders to the searching scrutiny that would subject them to an ordeal that must inevitably test their truth. But who were those who did appear? Persons whose efforts to establish a Union School had been frustrated, and who from other causes were cherishing vindictive feelings, that were made apparent at the opening of the meeting. One Mr. F., attempted to introduce confusion into the proceedings of the Committee, by throwing out a tirade of abuse against members of the committee in particular, and the Seminary in general, and also by impudently insisting upon adjournment without assigning any good reason. After some delay the Committee succeeded in reducing him to a certain degree of order, whereupon the other gentleman, Mr. David E., arose and urged that the pupils boarding in the Seminary should be called upon to give testimony. The boarders were accordingly summoned, but after they were seated, Mr. David E. remarked that one of the pupils was absent from whom he wished to elicit evidence. This pupil was immediately sent for; but when he came it appeared that Mr. E., desired his testimony to justify him (Mr. E.) in publishing an innuendo, injurious to the Seminary, that had appeared in the *Republican* about the time of the Union School movement. Mr. E. stated that his article was founded upon information received from this pupil during a conversation held with him. But alas for Mr. E., it was proved by the testimony of his own witness, that the conversation alluded to, did not occur till

after the offensive article was published, and also that he had never given Mr. E. any information that could be construed derogatory to the character of the Seminary. Mr. E. was then forced to acknowledge in the presence of all assembled that he could have had no authority for his article, save the idle rumors floating in the community. This was a humiliating confession for the editor of a public journal to make; but as the facts were evident he could do no otherwise. Soon after this one of the committee objected to the presence of the Teachers, and they unhesitatingly withdrew.

The investigation then proceeded without any restraint from the presence of teachers, although the rude and ungentlemanly behavior of one or two of these gentlemen present, was not calculated to preserve order and decorum in the meeting. The evidence of the pupils was taken relative to the charges against the Seminary; by this nothing was proved contrary to the report of the Committee. And now what does Mr. Gray know of the proceedings of this Committee? Was he there? No. Although he had been particularly invited to attend the meeting, he preferred to remain away, and receive afterwards, the irregular and untruthful reports of a few prejudiced individuals. This I apprehend is the secret of the origin of the whole matter with Mr. Gray. He has been quite too ready to receive and circulate the vile rumors that may always be found in the community, as an expression of facts. This can but be evident, even to the careless observer, since very few of his assertions are confined to subjects, that have come under his own personal observation. It is certainly to be regretted that he has allowed his mind to be so warped by prejudice, that it is no longer open to conviction of truth.

With regard to the expulsion of pupils, I will merely make a concise statements of facts as I have them from undoubted authority. Of A. G. Humphrey, one of the number whose "testimony" Mr. Gray introduces, I would say, soon after he entered the institution the Principals learned in a casual conversation that he had been a Methodist exhorter; becoming disaffected he joined the Congregational Church. The impression left on their minds was that he still retained his standing in that church. He chose to join the Baptist Sabbath School, and labored there harmoniously, nothing coming to the knowledge of those with whom he co-operated, conflicting with the generally received truths of christianity. If views were then entertained and an influence then exerted thus conflicting, it was studiously kept from the knowledge of the Principals. It was supposed, if he had a standing in an evangelical christian church, that he possessed christianity; if *professing*, it was of course hoped he *possessed*

it. The Principals did not deem it their duty or business to inquire into his peculiarities of faith; they extended to him christian charity; did all in their power to aid him in getting an education; he being dependent upon his own exertions, they gave him employment when out of school and used their influence to secure for him the office of sexton, that the remuneration therefor might enable him the more independently to prosecute his studies. In November a series of prayer meetings was commenced in the Baptist church; he attended and took an active part, engaging in prayer, exhortation, &c., with seeming harmony, till the spirit of God was felt at work; many were interested, among the number were pupils at the Seminary, and they manifested a desire to attend the meetings. Then the true nature of the spirit Humphrey possessed was made manifest. Though not a member of the institution during this time, being engaged in teaching in the country, yet he would seek every opportunity to watch their movements, throw himself in the way of those who manifested an interest for their soul's salvation, and exert himself to divert their minds. When successful he would return to his home in high glee. When failing in unholy purpose, he would retire railing at and about them and all christians in general and Elder Estee in particular. These things coming to the knowledge of the Principals, enlightened them as to the real character of the influence he was exerting. They then took measures to inform themselves more fully, and found that he had been for a long time actively engaged in instilling into the minds of his associates what he termed liberal principles; that he regarded many of them as his converts; that he would exultingly point out different ones of this class as being proof against any christian influence that might be brought to bear. But it is truly a matter of rejoicing that of the number singled out as victims to his delusion, only one proved deaf to the calls of mercy. Soon after the meetings closed, Humphrey returned to the institution. The Principals were now aware of the sentiments he entertained and the character of the influence he would exert, secretly if not openly. They did not however deem it their right to refuse him admission because he *entertained* such sentiments, but did feel it their duty to be watchful of the influence he might exert by open expression of his sentiments. They found that he, with two or three others, gave free expression of their views before the society connected with the institution, and more, this community knew, that at the public exercises of this society, free expression of the sentiments of this class of individuals was given which in two or three original orations was so gratifying to the *idol* portion of the audience that some of them who deny the whole

system of christian religion, deny the Bible, and do not even acknowledge a God, cheered them while speaking.

It has been said the Principals permitted these declamations to be made public from policy. I believe I was pretty well acquainted with their feelings upon the subject at the time and will explain this point. During the time of the revival, they were censured in no measured terms for giving permission to students to attend. Censured not only by opposers of all religion, but joined in by some rabid sectarians. This caused an excitement which led to misrepresentations calculated to prejudice the minds of the more candid and charitable. They felt that they were misunderstood; that were those christians to be made acquainted with the fearful influence that was creeping into the institution, they would pause before passing judgment upon their course. After the exercises of the examination were closed, the Principals made equally public their views regarding such expression and supposed it distinctly understood that in future this influence should not be brought to bear upon pupils entrusted to their care by the expression of those sentiments in Compositions, Declamations, &c. It seems however that they were not sufficiently explicit for this class of pupils to understand, since this course was continued by them in the private influence exerted; in the exercise of the Society and in their compositions which at last led to a misunderstanding resulting in quite a public expression of what could but be regarded as disrespectful feelings towards the Principals and teachers. These pupils were called to an account; confessions were made by them and they were reinstated with the understanding that no more productions of the kind would be tolerated before the school. Two or three days after, these pupils sought an interview with the Principals during which they claimed it as their privilege and demanded it as their right to continue the expression before the school of the same and similar sentiments as contained in the compositions alluded to (in one of which the Bible was denied, in another the existence of a God denied, &c.,) and further, that they should regard their teachers as pursuing a course of injustice if they were to restrict them in this expression. Now how does this matter stand? Here are pupils telling their teachers that they have made an unjust restriction, that here is a regulation of their school (which they as christians, &c., as they would guard the soul's interest, of their pupils, saw it necessary to make,) which they cannot comply with, without feeling that they are unjustly dealt by. Now what is to be done? Is the school room to be given up to become the rostrum from which shall be proclaimed from week to week.

"There is no truth in the christian religion," "There is no Divine inspiration about the Bible," "There is no God," &c., &c., with no small share of bombast which with the youthful and unsuspecting students might pass for argument, perhaps proof? Are those Principals and teachers to yield their duty to make such regulations and rules for the government of their school as shall secure to their pupils the safety that the christian parent has a right to expect of christian teachers? They chose to assert their right to require of pupils obedience to wholesome and just regulations. If that obedience was not cheerfully rendered, and if a course of discipline failed to secure such obedience what alternative was there, but to break the connection of teacher and pupil? This was done at the request of the Principals. I doubt not the same thing would have been done as promptly under the same circumstances, the first term the school was organized under the Charter, as now, (notwithstanding Mr. Gray's profound research (?) of Blackstone, which he must have made to enable him to expound the law with so much artifice). I have yet to learn that there is anything in the charter under which they organized either expressed or implied that is now or would have been then violated.

As regards the basis of which Mr. Gray brags so loudly, I will merely say, judging from the whole course of Misses Wood & Gregory since they have been among us, I firmly believe that had they for a moment supposed they were organizing under a charter which could be thus construed or which was thus understood and acted upon by the Board, they would have sooner sacrificed situation, reputation as teachers, anything and every thing the natural heart holds dear, then thus to have sacrificed principle. Further, I have the assurance of the originator of the said charter and of the "Liberalist Editor" whose acts are introduced as testimony of so much moment, that no such view was taken of the subject by them, and no such thing expressed or implied in their advocacy of the institution and its Principals. Here I would indulge in a few reflections. If Mr. Gray saw that the school as then organized under said charter, was not on a Bible basis (as every christian will concede such an institution *should be*) why did he wink at the iniquity? Why did he use every artifice he was master of to secure a controlling influence in the school? Why did he from time to time make propositions to the Board and to the Principals for arrangements which would secure a Presbyterian basis? For example when the school became known abroad so that there was a demand for boarding accommodations, why did Mr. Gray propose that the boarding department should be given to him with power to control the students, and teachers in all matters out side of the

school rooms? Why name certain regulations to which they should subscribe, such as "keeping of Saturday nights," having their Sabbath to commence with the setting sun on Saturday night? Was Mr. G. then willing to enter into the "Shylock bond" and "consummate the fraud," he charges upon the Principals in "their introduction of a 'Bible basis' &c.?" How could he so calmly contemplate such an "unholy wedlock" when he was to be one of the parties. I see no way but that the inconsistency can be reconciled, even, we admit as Mr. Gray has made, "that, as a Presbyterian could not be a Baptist, while a Baptist could be a Presbyterian, while a Baptist could be a Presbyterian, though not a word or act of a Presbyterian to the advantage of Baptists, yet the exclusive nature of the latter error would render the school sectarian in the highest degree." Then Mr. Gray must have thought to secure a controlling influence in the school—make all to subscribe to Presbyterian regulations, &c., without any "violation of charter;" without any "moral fraud;" without any "unholy wedlock with infidels;" without any "change of basis;" without any "Bible basis." Surely here is a mystery I will not attempt to unravel. I will only add; what a pity it is, since the ladies in their choice of a home in a christian church, were actuated by motives of policy as Mr. Gray has insinuated, that they were not far sighted enough to join *his* church and thus have avoided all this criminality which now (in his eyes) necessarily attaches itself to their every act as Baptists! Really, I believe had they been willing to receive a few gratuitous lessons from him and put them in practice, they would have done so. How ungrateful he must think them for all his earnest advice and deep solicitude for them about the time they were deciding this momentous question.

As regards the visits of Rev. Estee at the Seminary I would premise this point with the remark that I do not consider it Mr. Gray's or any other individual's business, who or how frequently visitors are received by the Principals at their own house, providing such visits do not in any way interfere with the rights and privileges of pupils or prove detrimental to the interests of the school, hence those Principals should not condescend to make a public expose of their register of visitors. I will simply say that the ladies whom Mr. Gray anathematizes so vehemently, hold themselves in readiness to give their oaths if required, regarding the statements made on this point in the letter of June 2d. Now for a moment glance at the comparative weight of testimony. Here are six teachers of undoubted veracity, professing and I doubt not, truly possessing christianity, the majority of whom were in the Seminary during the whole time of

Rev. B., stay in Mr. Carroll. These teachers at all times at liberty to occupy the same parlor with the Principals, and visitors enjoying their confidence to an unlimited degree, observers of their every act and cognizant of almost their every thought pertaining to the interests of the school. They *voluntarily* gave their testimony, which testimony would be most fully and cheerfully endorsed by scores of most reliable students who were also resident in the same family at the same time. Mr. Gray's testimony regarding the same matter, "viz" the visits of Rev. B., at the Seminary, is the say so and think so of Miss S. Randall, a disaffected pupil, one of the liberalists whom Mr. G., includes I presume as an "implied expelled pupil." This young lady did not board in the Seminary, was not at all in the family of the Principals, was not even in the school or school building the whole of school hours, coming in only to recite two lessons during each day, remaining perhaps during the time which might intervene between the two recitations. This young lady's "think so" is Mr. Gray's testimony as he terms it, by which he expects to set aside the testimony of the teachers and students almost en masse. The absurdity of Mr. Gray's position is sufficient refutation of itself. Let a decision not prompted by sectarian bitterness, jealousy and envy be given on this point and I have not a shadow of apprehension but the Principals will stand acquitted. Miss R.'s, statements with regard to fancied slights shows too plainly the jealousy of her nature. The fact of Miss Randall being in school only to recite and not being in classes reciting to either Misses Wood or Gregory, it might have happened that days or even weeks elapsed without Miss W., meeting Miss R., at a suitable time and place to recognise her. As to those ladies intentionally avoiding and slighting my pupil, I think they have too much self respect to condescend to such a course and none but a jealous or uncultivated mind would conceive such things. Further comment is unnecessary. I will in concluding this point repeat what is conceded by every candid reader of Mr. Gray's articles, that to go into refutation of his statements is altogether useless—the absurdities which characterize them all, are so palpable that they carry their own refutation on the face of them. I would willingly devote more time to alleviating the Reverend gentleman's sufferings, as he complains so bitterly of his pains. &c., but more important duties claim my attention and I will close with expressing my regret that Mr. Gray has felt himself so "pushed" as to involve the necessity of his making as public and humiliating exposure of his literary attainments as he has done in the publication of his pamphlet. He has done for himself a work in lowering his own standing in the community that he was then a member of, that the

most bitter opponent might not have been able to do. I can but regard him as scores and hundreds in this community and surrounding country feel and express themselves, that he is a fallen foe and slain by his own hand.

NATHANIEL HALDERMAN.

A LETTER FROM MR. SHIMER.

MR. HALDERMAN.

As Elder C. Gray, in his recent pamphlet against the Seminary, has renewed his attack upon the Baptist Church, allow me a small space, in connection with your review, to reply to his charges on this point.

I have doubted much the necessity for any reply. The misrepresentations and perversions contained in the pamphlet, are so numerous obvious and gross, and the spirit exhibited is so far removed from christian candor, that to most minds the work must carry on its face its own refutation. In one of his own newspaper articles, the Elder speaks of Rev. S. A. Estee as "one of the clearest headed out spoken and perhaps devoted of Baptists." This sentence, except in its grammatical construction, is very correct. It would be well for this community if *all* our divines were as clear headed and devoted as he. The infidel and the minister of the gospel would not embrace each other quite so cordially. They would not join hands for the purpose of crushing two or three defenceless females. This statement will appear more obvious, when it is remembered that the crusade is opened against them, not on account of any immorality, not because they are incompetent for the posts they occupy, not because they have been unfaithful, as teachers, in the discharge of their duties. All they claim on these points is fully conceded by the opposition. But they have dared to connect themselves with a Christian Church, and that not the one of which Elder Gray is pastor.

In *this* consisted the mortal offence. One party of the opposing compact, objects to their connection with the church of their choice; the other party objects to their union with any church, whatever, and so bitter is the spirit of opposition that both parties unite and

labor together, as best they can, to destroy the Seminary and the Baptist Church. "Pilate and Herod were made friends the same day." The great argument of the Elder, upon which rests the entire weight of all he has written, and which if unsound, must insure a total defeat of his efforts, is stated by him thus:

"The Baptist faith, true or false, involves in it such an element of superstition, and intolerance, that it necessitates the Baptist character of the Seminary." "What is water Baptism? First, it is immersion only. What more by that faith? Second. It is the only Bible Baptism now, Holy Ghost Baptism is denied and supplanted. What more? Third. It is the alone door, entrance into the Church of Christ. What more? Just as certainly as it is the last, it is one thing more, it is the door into the church of Christ, it is Christ—a water Christ." The argument is here fairly stated. Having made out this "water Christ" we find the phrase, with a little variation to "water God," "water Christ God," "water Baptism Christ," "water Trine God," &c., repeated twenty-one times within less than two and a half pages of his pamphlet. Why this repetition? Here surely must have been an object in view. Before I close this article, I will inform the reader, what that object was; for there are some "developments," perhaps "painful" ones, to be made with reference to the Elder, and the controversy has now reached a point where at least a few of these are demanded. But we will first look at the assertion that the Baptist faith makes Baptism Christ, a "Water Christ." The special attention of the reader is asked to this point. The Elder presents the argument again in the following language: "With the Baptist there is no getting into the church, the fold of Christ, except in, thorough water Baptism. It is the alone door entrance. (John 10th chapter 1, 7 and 9th verses). Christ is the alone bible door. Then if Baptism is a bible door it is Christ."

I will now quote the article of the Baptist faith, which treats of Baptism and the Lord's supper. Let the reader examine it. This is the only article of our faith on these two ordinances, and the identical one read in public at the organization of the Baptist Church in Mount Carroll, in the presence of hundreds. It reads as follows: "*We believe that christian Baptism is the immersion in water of a believer, into the name of the Father and Son, and Holy Ghost, to show faith in a solemn and beautiful emblem our faith in the crucified burial, and risen Savior, with its effect in our death to sin and resurrection to a new life; that it is a pre-requisite to the privileges of a church relation; and to the Lord's Supper, in which the members of the church by the sacred use of bread and wine, are to commemorate together the dying love of Christ; preceded always by solemn self ex-*

animation." I will here observe that all divines, all christians and the Bible itself make a distinction between the *visible* church or kingdom of Christ, and the *invisible*. The visible embraces all who wear the profession of christianity, whether true christians, hypocrites or self-deceived, the invisible embraces all those and only those who are truly pious. *Christ is the only door into this invisible kingdom.* This doctrine we fully, unqualifiedly believe. A Baptist minister denying or repudiating it would be deposed from the sacred office, and expelled from the church. But is Christ the door into the visible church? Charles Buch, a pedobaptist, in his theological dictionary, a standard work of world-wide reputation, says: "*Baptism, the ceremony of washing or the application of water to a person in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, by which he is initiated into the visible church.*" The last clause of this sentence sets forth the doctrine of christendom on this subject, the denial of Elder Gray to the contrary notwithstanding. The Presbyterian confession of faith on page 144 says: "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptised into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins," &c. Now let the Elder "deny it flatly." There may possibly be a few wandering stars like himself who will repudiate it, for a purpose; but the mass of pedobaptists, hold it. What authority does the Elder give to sustain his position that Baptism is not a prerequisite to the privileges of a church-relation, and the Presbyterians do not regard it as such? It is the following. "Bring me twenty candidates and I will admit every one, on his confession of Christ before man, as in our covenant, and then administer the sacrament, and afterwards baptize them, * * * "But plainer still I have done this very thing." * * * "Now get my Presbytery to depose me." The authority then is not the word of God. It is no commentary on the sacred scriptures. It is no theological work whatever. It is "I" "I will do it." "I have done it." Yes, he has reversed the ordinances of the Gospel of Christ, and glories in it. Truly the tiara should be transferred from the vatican to Mt. Carroll. Elder Calvin Gray could wear it with a grace.

Elder Gray's Presbytery may not depose him for such absurdities but one thing I assert, they will *never* endorse them. They may tolerate this reversal of the ordinances of the Gospel just as they tolerate him in sprinkling persons, in the name of the Trinity, and afterwards immersing them without any ceremony, in order to satisfy his own

conscience, and the consciences of the candidates. Beyond the *mere act of toleration* I dare say they will not go. The question now arises, why did Elder Gray confound the *visible church or kingdom of Christ* with the invisible, and by that process of confounding, manufacture the "water Christ?" Did he not *know* that he was falsifying? Is there a man of candor in this community who believes he did not know it? If so I honor that man's charity but not his perspicacity. The key to the whole matter is found here. The Elder had an *object to accomplish* and the end must justify the means. That object *must* be accomplished at *all hazards*. Come life, come death, that object *must* be accomplished. I have promised to state what that object is. But there are other links in the chain of his argument which must first be noticed. He says, "the Baptists immerse *into* not *unto*—not in the name of, but *into* Christ. He immerses *into* the Holy Ghost." I quote these sentences *verbatim et literatim*. The Elder must be responsible on the score of grammar; if the pronoun does not agree with its antecedent the fault is not mine. As it respects what is declared I have only to say that it is *false*. No regular Baptist minister does so. *None ever did so*. He adds, "These arguments can be subterfuged;" &c., why they *need no subterfuging, not a word of explanation*. The assertion is simply *false*. Here are some eight thousand regular Baptist ministers now preaching the gospel and administering its ordinances in the United States. Now let Elder Gray produce an instance in which one of these has baptized otherwise than in, or into, the *name* of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Till then let him stand convicted of having deliberately published to the world what is false. I am surprised to find the Elder so flippant in his criticisms upon the doctrines and practice of Rev. Mr. Estee, when he never heard him preach a sermon or deliver an address. All he knows concerning his teachings, has been peddled out to him, second, third or fourth handed by those whose sectarianism and bigotry nearly equalled his own, and sadly warped both judgment and conscience. But he had an object to accomplish, and every breath of *floating gossip*; no matter how *low* and *false* or *slandorous*, must be carefully collected, and treasured up for that purpose. Even the *few malcontents* who had forfeited their standing in the Seminary, have been carefully hunted up and *pumped*, and their one-sided spleenful statements paraded in his pamphlet to assist in the accomplishment of that object. Again. The Baptist church is charged with a violation of contract. Elder Gray states it thus:—"When the Presbyterian meeting room was hired, for the Baptists alternate Sabbaths (as I understood it) there was an explicit

condition in the contract, that neither party were to present their peculiar doctrines in the pulpit." In reference to this charge I have to say that the contract was made by Elder Gray and another individual before the Baptist church had an existence.

Minutes of the contract were taken at the time, which are still on hand. In these minutes is the following express stipulation: "Doctrinal sermons are not to be preached by either party as a general thing—but either party shall have full liberty to preach on the subject and explain their peculiar views at the close of 'protracted meetings to the converts, or at other times at the request of inquirers.'" Now according to the Elder's showing there was "one regular baptismal sermon" preached by elder Everhart (not the pastor of the Baptist church) in the course of the year. I ought to inform the reader that that was *not* a Baptismal sermon, but it embraced some remarks on the subject of christian baptism. Beyond this I need not go. All can judge of the truthfulness of the Elder's statement, when they see it as above, placed side by side, with the stipulation quoted from the minutes of the contract. Yet this statement is just about as truthful as all the others he has made on the subjects of the controversy. How he expects to be believed by *his strongest partizan friends* is indeed a "riddle."

Another charge is stated thus: "Soon after a member of the Presbyterian church, united with the Baptist church in violation of her covenant. This was done notwithstanding my urgent request, sent by her husband, that she might delay one week, pledging an effort to obtain a letter for her." In reply to this I will state, that this lady presented *her request for a letter to Elder Gray, in his own house, previously to the business meeting of his church, and delayed her Baptism to obtain it, but the meeting passed by and no letter was granted.* Some time afterwards word was sent to her, by Elder Gray to wait till the next meeting of the church. She supposing the course pursued was designed to embarrass her, in effecting a union with the church of her choice, regarded it as a breach of the ecclesiastical compact between herself and the Presbyterian church, and consequently made no further effort to obtain a letter. Here I ask, why did not the Elder make a correct statement of this case? Why were some of the most important facts left out? Why this utter perversion? Why do we find the words "*covenant oath breaker, perjured,*" employed to indicate the character of this lady? It is intended by the Elder, as one more link in the chain by which he hopes to accomplish that "one alone" object which he has kept steadily in view, ever since he commenced his attack upon the Seminary,

and the object which beyond all doubt, prompted that attack. I will now state the object. *It is to create in his parishioners, and as far as possible in all others, a spirit of sectarianism sufficiently strong to keep them from attending Baptist meetings or associating with Baptists any where—even in an institution of learning.* He may deny this but it is useless for him to do so. The evidence is overwhelming. Persons not living in this community will be surprised to learn that Elder Gray has preached more on the subject of Baptism, within the last six months than all the Baptist ministers have ever done in Mt. Carroll. They will be surprised to learn too, having heard his hue and cry, about the Principals of the Seminary having been proselyted, that the very next morning after those ladies had taken a decided stand in favor of christianity, they were visited at their boarding house, by Elder Gray, but never by a Baptist minister, until they had united with the church. This too was not the only visit they received from the Elder while they stood uncommitted. They will be surprised, and so will some of this community, to learn also that Elder Gray, previously to the organization of the Baptist church in Mt. Carroll, expressed himself as being *favorable* to the project, assigning as his reason, that it would help to *weaken* the influence of the Methodist church. That church he considered the rival then, but since the Baptist church has enjoyed a measure of prosperity and enlargement, this feeling of hostility has been transferred to it. How derogatory to the ministerial and christian character! How painfully opposed to christianity is such a sentiment and the spirit that prompts it.

Now this object, *to create and foster a bigoted, bitter, exclusive sectarian prejudice by which the spread of Baptist sentiments may be prevented, in the future—is the "one alone" object, for which the Elder has taxed all his powers.* This is the key (and this community knows it) that unlocks the attack upon the Seminary. It unlocks the trinity and unity—the Seminary, the Baptist church and the distillery. It unlocks the advocacy of the Union Graded School. It unlocks the attack upon Rev. S. A. Estee. It unlocks the charge of the violation of contract. It unlocks that of covenant-oath breaking perjury. It unlocks that of proselyting. It unlocks also the "superstition, intolerance and force of the Baptist faith." And last but not least it unlocks the "Water Christ," the "Water Christ God," the "Water triune God."

But I have already occupied too much space and will forbear. There is a just God who reigns on high, and whose control extends even to the minutest things of earth. What His own hand has planted

and His omnipotence guards man cannot destroy. I will only add that if the cause of the Mt. Carroll Seminary is not sufficiently just to secure the protection of Heaven, and the co-operation of good men, then there is no just cause and no justice on earth. Should the Seminary be "crushed" and no retribution follow, then will the blood of no new Abel ever move towards Heaven. The Cains of humanity will stalk proudly abroad, and with impious brow look down upon the wreck of the temple of justice and truth.

HENRY SHIMER.

A CARD OF MANY CITIZENS.

(The following card is inserted as an expression of sentiment relative to the matter in question, entertained by the persons whose signatures are annexed. These names however comprise but a small fraction of those who entertain similar views.)

Inasmuch as a discussion has been for some time past going on in the public print in this place, the tendency of which may have led those unacquainted with circumstances, to believe the Mt Carroll Seminary to be connected with it as a "sectarian institution," and the conduct of its Principals to have been in opposition to the feelings and wishes of its patrons, we the undersigned citizens of Mt. Carroll and vicinity, wish to disabuse the public mind of any such impression if such has been the result.

We believe the school to have been conducted with a view to its best interests. We have full confidence in its Principals as highly qualified and fitted for the post they occupy, and believe their management of the school to have been praiseworthy in a high degree, and of that character that entitles them to public patronage and confidence. Taking a deep interest as we do in the institution, we take this method of publicly expressing the feelings we hold in relation to it, hoping that this statement of our views, which we consider in justice due, not only to ourselves and the public, but to the Seminary and those connected with it, may have the effect of removing any wrong impressions, that in the heat of controversy may have been produced in the public mind. We deeply regret, and we think our community generally does, that anything should have occurred during the controversy alluded to, of a tendency calculated to place the school in an

unfavorable light before the public. Misses Wood and Gregory, after a praiseworthy effort in overcoming the obstacles that always arise in building up such an institution, have succeeded in establishing the Seminary upon a permanent basis and in making it a subject of pride and gratulations to all who have in view the educational interests of this community or state. And as citizens, most deeply interested in its welfare, and upon whom devolves the cherishing and protection of every institution, which has for its object the general improvement, we deeply condemn every movement that has a tendency in the slightest degree to send abroad an impression in the least unfavorable to it.

Wm. T. Miller,
John Rinewalt,
H. Smith,
Lewis Chrisman,
Wm. P. Baird,
J. H. Bohn,
George Fisher,
Daniel Palmer,
Dr. B. P. Miller,
Samuel J. Campbell,
W. J. Wood,
Henry Zuck,
B. Lepman,
John Wilson,
Harlyn Pyle,
John P. White,
John Irvine, Sen.,
J. M. Shirk,
H. Colchower,
Elhanan Fisher,
James O'Brien,
A. Beeler,
J. C. Owings,
Charles Bennett,
Porter Sargent,
B. Wakely,
C. Fleming,
John Kridler,
Reuben Waters,
A. Bohn,
Henry Hollingsworth,
A. Carpenter,
Emanuel Stover,
Geo. B. Miles,
Volney Armour,
Ansel Bailey,
M. L. Harrington,
Edmund Moore,

John S. Shirk,
Henry C. Perry,
Charles DePuy,
J. G. Blake,
Smith Bennett,
Elijah Bailey,
L. H. Olney,
Charles S. Wilson,
S. S. Dunn,
Charles Holman,
H. J. Griffith,
Henry Shimer,
Henry Poffenberger,
Wm. Bramhall,
Thomas D. Davis,
John Rhoads,
John Shimer,
John Eaker,
Daniel Hurley,
Wm. St Clair Miller,
John Mackay,
A. E. Widney,
Benjamin Jacobs,
Warren Jones,
George H. Dushaw,
John B. Christian,
Joseph S. Stricker,
Wm. Borgess,
C. E. Cross,
J. Buterbaugh,
Levi Hoffecker,
Wm. J. Mertz,
C. Kellogg,
Casper Irtel, M. D.,
Joel Fitch,
Joseph Warfield,
Wm. Rahn,
J. R. Switzer,

John McCracken,
 Samuel Preston,
 J. V. Allison,
 Samuel P. Colehower,
 George Roe,
 Cyrus H. Reine,
 George Hollinger,
 L. G. Thorp,
 Owen P. Miles,
 John Tridel,
 Benjamin Strickler,
 Nathaniel Halderman,
 Ezra Austin,
 L. Heffelfinger,
 Thomas Forbes,
 H. G. Fisher,
 H. Rothchild,
 Duncan Mackay,
 George W. Kiter,
 John Smith,
 E. Keepers,
 Daniel Freid,

D. B. Colehower,
 Elijah Funk,
 S. L. Buckley,
 J. B. Smith,
 Kelsey Kenyon,
 Ira L. Bailey,
 Joshua Bailey,
 C. W. Tomlinson,
 Francis Trail,
 N. H. Melandy,
 C. Van Vechten,
 Geo. W. Stitely,
 E. Broek,
 Joshua Burnett,
 Jackson Beaver,
 D. W. Pennick,
 Monroe Bailey,
 Herman E. Pyerls,
 John A. Melandy,
 B. B. Tomlinson,
 D. B. Tomlinson,
 George English.

As an apology for the late issue of this pamphlet, I would say, that although the whole of it was ready for the printer within two weeks after the issue of Mr. Gray's pamphlet, yet unavoidable circumstances prevented attention being given to its publication.

N. H.